```
1cfeter1
1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
      IN RE TERRORIST ATTACKS ON
      SEPTEMBER 11, 2001,
 4
                                              03 MDL 1570 (GBD)
5
 6
                                               December 15, 2011
 7
                                               10:48 a.m.
 8
     Before:
9
                          HON. GEORGE B. DANIELS,
10
                                               District Judge
11
                                 APPEARANCES
12
     MELLON WEBSTER & SHELLY
13
           Attorneys for Havlish Plaintiffs
           THOMAS MELLON, JR.
14
           THOMAS MELLON, III,
           STEPHEN A. CORR
15
           DENNIS PANTAZIS
     WIGGINS CHILDS QUINN & PANTAZIS
16
           Attorneys for Plaintiffs
17
     BY: TIMOTHY B. FLEMING
18
     ANDERSON KILL & OLICK
           Attorneys for O'neill Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs' Executive
19
           Committee
     BY: JERRY GOLDMAN
20
      COZEN O'CONNOR
21
           Attorneys for Federal Insurance
     BY: SEAN CARTER
22
     MOTLEY RICE, LLC
23
          Attorneys for Burnett Plaintiffs
     BY: ROBERT T. HAEFFLE
24
      JD LEE
25
           Attorney for Plaintiffs
```

(In open court)

1cfeter1

THE COURT: So that we can use this time efficiently, we can turn, I guess, to Mr. Mellon --

MR. MELLON: Yes, your Honor. Good morning.

THE COURT: -- and your application to enter a default judgment against Iran.

What I'd like to do is I've reviewed substantially a significant amount of materials submitted. There are both materials submitted under seal and materials not under seal. What I'd like to do is give you an opportunity to summarize that material here on the public record. I'd like to keep this as a public record, so any reference that you make to sealed documents, just reference that particular file, other than the substance, on the record for those documents.

I've also received and reviewed your proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law in support of the application.

And I'm going to use that, unless you tell me otherwise, as a guide to follow you today.

MR. MELLON: Yes, your Honor. Exactly.

THE COURT: And the only other thing that I'm going to ask is if you could give me that on disk.

MR. MELLON: Yes.

THE COURT: So that if you can give me that right away on disk, I can either at the end of this hearing go ahead and adopt it in total or substantially in a form that you've given

to me, and I'll expedite it.

MR. MELLON: Your Honor, you'll have that tomorrow.

THE COURT: Great. Thank you.

Then let me let you go ahead and proceed in the manner in which you believe is appropriate.

MR. MELLON: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, we have passed up to the Court and law clerk a copy of a PowerPoint that we will be demonstrating for you in the next hour to perhaps, at tops, two hours. We have tried to discipline ourselves to be concise and pithy.

First let me begin, with the Court's permission, by one or two introductions.

My name again is Thomas E. Mellon, Jr., and I have the honor and pleasure of representing the plaintiffs in the Havlish case. Several of those plaintiffs are here today, your Honor. And I'd just like to acknowledge them, given the nature of their tragedy and their loss. Please stand when I call your name: Ms. Ellen Saracini, Ms. Fiona Havlish, Ms. Tara Bain, and Mikaela, who is the daughter of Fiona Havlish. Thank you very much. Oh Grace. Good Lord. And Grace Godshalk, which her son, William, was also lost in the towers. Thank you.

Your Honor, we are mindful of the amount of work that we have submitted to the Court on the Havlish claims. So our goal today was to take those claims and try to make them as centered and as focused as possible.

I'd now like to introduce those lawyers who have been working the case for the last ten years from around the country just, again, to acknowledge them and ask them to please stand.

First, working from my left to the right: Mr. Stephen Corr of Philadelphia; Mr. Ed Rubenstone of Philadelphia; Mr. Evan Yegelwel from Jacksonville, Florida; Ms. Mary Beth Ramey from Indianapolis; Ms. Melinda Goldfarb from Birmingham, Alabama.

And working again from my left, your Honor, Mr. Tim

Fleming, Thomas Mellon, Rich Hailey from Indianapolis; Dennis

Pantazis, also from Birmingham; and Bob Flick from Chicago, Bob

from Chicago. Oh, wait a second. All right. We got a whole

team here that I better not miss this, your Honor. I better

not. Dom Winder from Salt Lake City; Mr. JD Lee from

Knoxville; and Mr. Jack Corr from Philadelphia; and whoever

called that to my attention, thank you very much.

Your Honor, just a word about these attorneys. They have worked tirelessly for ten years, travelling to Europe 22 times, reviewing thousands of documents, hundreds and hundreds of hours of interviews. What we would like today to do is very briefly discuss the law. And let me explain that.

We thought we were going to spend 30 to 40 minutes discussing the law, but the *Owens* opinion came out as we know on November 28th. And the *Owens* opinion goes right down the line, and it involves Iran, Hezbollah and Al-Qaeda. So after

1cfeter1

ten years of us writing the law, worrying about the law, analyzing the law, a gift was given to us, a holiday gift on November 28th, and that is the law has been really delineated very specifically.

So with the Court's permission, we're not going to spend 30, 40 minutes on the law. We're going to get right to the facts that we think compels your Honor, respectfully, to consider awarding a case against Iran, Hezbollah, and of course, Al-Qaeda.

THE COURT: I do have the *Owens* opinion. I did receive that recently from you.

MR. MELLON: Thank you, your Honor. We found that very illuminating, and I might honestly say a great relief.

Your Honor, here's how we'd like to proceed, with the Court's permission. We have a PowerPoint that we'll be using as an outline, but the PowerPoint follows the findings of fact and conclusions of law. So you will see a parallelism by design.

The first presentation will be by Mr. Timothy Fleming, who himself went to Europe 14 times. He will be discussing the overall thematic scheme, who the principals are, who the defendants are and the like.

May I have the first slide, please.

We had highlighted the sovereign defendants only.

There are 16. The nine sovereign defendants in our case are

already in default, and we would ask the Court respectfully to provide a default judgment against the nonsovereign defendants. But it is these 16 defendants here today that compels the presentation of testimony.

The next slide, please.

Your Honor, before we hear from Mr. Fleming, just a word about the law. We have perfected service in Washington, DC, and then again we perfected service here in the Southern District of New York. So actually, Iran, Hezbollah, and to the extent Al-Qaeda through publication — they have default entered twice, once December 23rd, out of the District of Columbia, and again on December 27th, here in the Southern District of New York.

Jurisdictionally speaking, besides service and entering the default, Iran is designated a state sponsor of terrorism. And most of the lawyers in this room know, certainly all we know that's been since 1984.

But, your Honor, this first slide is very important with regard to the following words, because today we hope to prove to the Court that Iran provided the following to Al-Qaeda over the course of years. That material support would be defined as any property, tangible or intangible, and here we go, this is what Iran did: They provided service, including currency or monetary instruments and financial securities, financial services; they provided lodging; Iran provided

training; they provided expert advice and assistance to Al-Qaeda. Iran provided safe houses, false documentation and identification. They provided Al-Qaeda with communications equipment. They provided Al-Qaeda with facilities, weapons, lethal substances. They provided Al-Qaeda with explosives, personnel and transportation. In other words, your Honor, for jurisdictional purposes, we must show some material support. We hope to show the Court in the next hour an abundance of many different types of material support.

Finally, for jurisdiction, our plaintiffs are US nationals. And, of course, we cite as last comment on the law, the *Owens* case.

Your Honor, I believe that brings us to the part of our presentation where Mr. Timothy Fleming will be giving us the overview, the general themes of what we investigated. I will return for purposes of specifically and detailedly defining our expert reports. They are 1,100 pages. I know that's way too much, but I think I can break it down to 50 paragraphs with a little time.

Your Honor, at this time, Mr. Timothy Fleming.
MR. FLEMING: Good morning, your Honor.

This morning I'm humbled to present evidence on behalf of the Havlish plaintiffs, who have been appointed by my colleagues to present a substantial portion of the evidence that we've submitted to the Court in this case.

The evidence in this case demonstrates that the Islamic Republic of Iran, the principal defendant, as well as the defendants, agencies and instrumentalities of Iran, including its terrorist proxy organization, Hezbollah, materially and directly supported Al-Qaeda's attacks on the United States on September 11, 2001.

Iran's material and direct support for Al-Qaeda included the facilitation of the hijackers' international movements and coordination of activities, to conceal the hijackers' travel to the Al-Qaeda training camps in Afghanistan almost a year before 9/11. The evidence also shows that Iran had preknowledge that the 9/11 attacks were to occur and that Iranian officials met with Al-Qaeda plotters before and after 9/11. And the evidence shows that the 9/11 attacks themselves were based upon a contingency plan for attacking the United States that was designed by Iran.

Finally, after 9/11 occurred, Iran facilitated the escape of Al-Qaeda leaders and operatives from Afghanistan at the time of the United States invasion. And thereafter, Iran provided years of safe haven and refuge for hundreds of Al-Qaeda operatives and major Al-Qaeda leaders inside Iran, where they continued to engage in terrorism and to direct terrorist activities in the Middle East and throughout the world.

Now, to understand the role that Iran and Hezbollah,

as well as the other agencies and instrumentalities played in 9/11, we must trace some of the history of the Iran, Hezbollah and Al-Qaeda relationship, which I will try to describe as briefly and as economically at least as possible, but it is rather detailed and it is tremendously important.

Now, there are evidentiary references -- excuse me. There are references to the evidentiary record in the voluminous materials that we have already submitted to the Court last May, July and August in our findings of fact, as well as in our lengthy briefs. So I won't attempt to repeat them here. However, I will make some -- as your Honor pointed out, I will make some references to the sealed testimony, and I will -- for those items I will try to supply some specific references. We could do that also in writing, if you would prefer. They are not in the PowerPoint or in the binders that you have.

Now, with respect to that yesterday, we filed a motion to partially unseal evidence. And the purpose of that was because, as we had previously explained to the Court when we filed the motion to seal the testimony, principally the testimony of the three defector Iranian defector witnesses, there were major concerns about their safety and security, which continue to this day for certain.

However, we have been able to at least secure the agreement of the person I formally identified as witness \mathbf{X} to

reveal his name and to reveal his evidence with certain limited exceptions. And that is why I said motion to partially unseal even as to witness X. It's very limited portions. We actually have someone still scouring the transcript to make sure that we can eliminate from the public record references to people who would be in great danger, other than witness X, those people being in Iran principally.

And so what we propose to do, if your Honor is disposed to grant the motion to partially unseal, would be to refile witness X's testimony both as to the transcript and as to the videotaped testimony that would eliminate various small portions which are designed to try to assure the safety of people. We could do that very quickly, particularly as to the transcript. The videotape might be a little bit — we may have to do some editing, but if your Honor is disposed to grant that motion, that is how we would like to proceed.

THE COURT: I don't think I received a motion. You just filed it electronically? I don't think I received a copy in chambers.

MR. CORR: Your Honor, it was filed electronically probably around 3:30 yesterday afternoon.

THE COURT: So I was not notified that -- do you have a courtesy copy that I can review or discuss? Otherwise, I'll pull it down when we come back to it.

MR. FLEMING: I'm sorry, your Honor. We don't seem to

have a namer convof

1cfeter1

have a paper copy of it. I can say it was fairly general and didn't include even all the details that I've just related.

Now, it should be understood that as your Honor may recall, there is also a sealed affidavit of the person known as witness X. That was always intended to be permanently sealed, and that would not come within the purview of the motion to unseal. And so that, as well as my affidavit explaining some of those circumstances, would remain under seal.

THE COURT: Do you have with your motion a carefully drafted proposed order in terms of what you think would be consistent with that partial unsealing?

MR. FLEMING: I don't think we filed something that would fit that description. Yes, your Honor, but we can do so certainly by tomorrow, or we can do it -- I can do it verbally right here.

THE COURT: Well, I would do it in the form that you think will release that much of the material and no more than the material than you intended. I don't want to inadvertently unseal something that, the way you're describing it now, under certain things, you say still should remain under seal. So if you could either articulate it clearly on the record or craft it for my signature, which is probably the better thing to do, go ahead and craft it carefully for my signature. I'll pull the motion up now, start reviewing it now so I can sign it as soon as you submit it, if it conforms with the motion.

MR. FLEMING: It was my intention, your Honor, this morning to discuss the testimony of witness X and reveal his name as part of my presentation, which, of course, would be consistent with the parameters that we would be suggesting. Is that all right?

THE COURT: And you're asking, at least to the extent that you want to discuss it today, that it be unsealed for that purpose --

MR. FLEMING: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- to that extent during this discussion?

I will grant that motion, and then I will formally consider and grant the entire motion, as you've laid it out, as soon as we pull the papers and I start looking at it. And then I will sign an order consistent.

MR. FLEMING: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. MELLON: Your Honor, if I may speak to it, we have just received permission from what has been known as witness X heretofore to release his name to the public and to discuss his testimony today before the Court. But that permission came only within the last 36, 48, 72 hours. And that is why there has been a last-minute paper rush. And I think that explains it. But we are prepared to tell you about his testimony today.

THE COURT: Okay. On that basis I will grant that motion to that extent, and then I'll review the complete papers and sign a broader order.

MR. MELLON: Thank you.

MR. FLEMING: To begin, your Honor, due to the default of all the defendants in this case, the Court may take as true — the allegations of the complaint as true. And that would include, of course, the fact that 9/11 occurred and that the decedent, the plaintiffs' decedents, were all victims of those terrorist attacks. And we will be proceeding on that assumption that that is the case.

Additionally, your Honor, I'd like to offer the exhibits that plaintiffs have already submitted to the Court and move their admission into evidence. Those exhibits are detailed in the list of exhibits that were attached to plaintiff's first memorandum of law; that is, the public — what we refer to generally as the public brief. And we would move into evidence Exhibits 1 through 20, Exhibit 22 through 25 and Exhibits 29 through 37.

THE COURT: Those will be admitted into evidence for purposes of the Court.

(Plaintiff's Exhibits 1 through 20, 22 through 25 and 29 through 37 received in evidence)

MR. FLEMING: Additionally, with respect to the sealed material, your Honor, I would like to offer and move for admission Exhibits S1 through S7 and -- excuse me. Actually, I'm going to move into evidence all of the exhibits, S1 through S44. And to the extent that those include -- and they

1cfeter1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

particularly do with respect to S1 through S7 -- they include the documents that were offered as exhibits at the time of the videotaped depositions that were taken in this case of witnesses X, Y and Z, and so I would move those to be admitted as well.

THE COURT: And those will be admitted into evidence. (Plaintiff's Exhibit S1 through S44 received in evidence)

THE COURT: Can you designate for the record which one of those are being unsealed at this point?

MR. FLEMING: Yes, your Honor. Being unsealed is Exhibit S1, S2, S3 and S4, again, with the limited redactions that we would need to make.

THE COURT: So you're not moving to unseal them in their entirety; you're moving to unseal them with redactions?

MR. FLEMING: With redactions, which will be very limited, I believe, your Honor.

Therefore, basically it is S5, S6 and S7, as well as the deposition exhibits attached to them which would remain under seal.

THE COURT: That are related to this particular witness?

MR. FLEMING: That's right. And then actually, I should point out a further detail. We had filed sealed copies of several of the expert witnesses who discussed the

testimonies of the witnesses. We would like to unseal those as well, to the extent that they address witness X. Well, it may not -- and we would like to provide those as well, because they would just remain -- we could keep the redactions as to the other two witnesses for the moment.

THE COURT: I think that probably what would be most efficient, is to file unsealed, redacted copies of the sealed documents so that there won't be any misunderstanding about the availability of the totally sealed docket.

MR. FLEMING: Very good, your Honor.

THE COURT: Those should remain sealed, and you should have permission to file an unsealed redacted copy of those documents to the extent that you move.

MR. FLEMING: Very good. Thank you, your Honor.

Now, your Honor, the defendant, Islamic Republic of Iran, has engaged in and has supported terrorism as an instrument of foreign policy ever since the Islamic Republic was — began after the Iranian revolution in 1979. Iran has been waging virtually an undeclared war against the United States and Israel for more than 30 years. This is not a metaphorical sense of a war or rhetorical use of the term. It's a very real and meaningful war, although quite an unconventional one; one that regularly employed the use of criminal acts and unconventional tactics, namely asymmetrical strategies of warfare and terrorism.

The victims, the casualties of this particular type of war, criminal war, have included thousands of innocent victims, including the plaintiffs' relatives who died on 9/11 who are the plaintiffs in this case today.

Iran has engaged in this war generally through proxies such as Hezbollah, Hamas, Al-Qaeda and others. And this is particularly important because it gives Iran plausible deniability, which creates or which allows it to avoid direct confrontation with the United States over these things, over these acts. This, as we'll see, will be very important when it comes to the planning of the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

Now, the US State Department has designated Iran as a foreign state sponsor of terror every year since 1984, ever since it began to make those designations, every single year. And indeed, since 1980, each and every one — and the Republic came into being, Islamic Republic came into being 1979. Every single year since 1980 each of the State Department's annual reports on terrorism describes the Iranian state's consistent involvement in acts of terror.

Now, briefly, your Honor, the two individual defendants in this case, the two individual defendants, the first is the Ayatollah Ali Hoseini Khamenei. He is the Supreme Leader of Iran, and he is certainly the most important and powerful official in Iran. He has the authority to make any decision, religious or political, or to appoint and remove

almost virtually any officer in the government.

Khamenei is and has been, since the death of Ayatollah Khomeini in 1989, has been the Supreme Leader of the Islamic Republic of Iran, and his term of office is unlimited. He is the commander in chief of the armed forces. He appoints the head of the military services. He declares war and peace. He can dismiss the elected president of the country, and he has many other powers delineated in the Constitution.

The popular media focus on when it comes to all things

Iran is to discuss the activities of and words of President

Mahmoud Ahmadinejad. This is a fundamental misunderstanding of
the governmental structure. Khamenei, the Supreme Leader, is
the real policy maker in Iran.

Secondly, the defendant Ali Akbar Hashemi Rafsanjani, the former president of Iran from 1997, was the Speaker of the Parliament during the 1980s, when Ayatollah Khomeini was the Supreme Leader. Rafsanjani is also one of the wealthiest individuals in Iran. And he was certainly, without question, the second most powerful figure in the Iranian government on September 11, 2001; indeed, from 1980 on to at least 2005. And he continues to hold very important posts to this day.

Khamenei and Rafsanjani both have long records of direct involvement in Iran's material support for terrorism.

And they have been cited in as key figures in many court cases in the federal courts of the United States and abroad, finding

Iranian state support for terrorism, and some of which have specifically named them as directing and ordering terrorist attacks, murders, assassinations, bombings and so forth.

One of those cases is known as the Mykonos case, which involved the -- in Europe, in Germany, involved the assassination of several Kurdish dissident leaders in a Greek restaurant in Berlin. The Court in Germany found that Khamenei and Rafsanjani personally ordered the assassinations to occur.

The defendant Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps, the acronym being the IRGC -- I will generally use that term, also known and discussed in the evidence in this case in some of the testimony as the Sepah Pasdaran, or simply the Sepah, or simply the Pasdaran -- that is an agency, that is an elite military force that is an agency and instrumentality of the Supreme Leader. It is answerable only to the Supreme Leader and to the concept of the Iranian revolution itself. It is parallel to the regular army. It is not subject to parliamentary supervision and it is not part of the formal government structure. It is a force unto itself. As appointed by the Constitution of Iran, it is the guardian of the Islamic revolution. And it is its striking force as well overseas.

It is also, the IRGC is also a major force in the Iranian economy. It holds billions of dollars of assets and government contracts in virtually every sector of the Iranian economy, including oil and gas, engineering,

telecommunications, infrastructure. It owns and controls the Khomeini Airport in Tehran.

The IRGC also engages in widespread criminal activity, including smuggling, drugs and alcohol and other things, and it is also deeply, deeply involved in terrorism. The IRGC has a special division called the Qods Force. Qods is Arabic for Jerusalem, which refers to the retaking of Jerusalem some day, the goal of retaking it. The Qods Force, or Jerusalem force, works with a militant overseas terrorist organization — terrorist organizations abroad promoting it and directing it and training for it. It has a long history of engaging in coups, assassinations and terrorist activities of every stripe. It is one of the most organized, disciplined and violent terrorist organizations in the world.

Witness Y, one of the sealed witnesses, was a former member of the IRGC's Qods Force. And he testifies at length about it, as do many of our experts. The United States

Treasury Department has designated the Qods Force as a terrorist organization for providing material support to the Taliban of Afghanistan and many other terrorist organizations. The State Department has designated the IRGC itself as a foreign terrorist organization.

The defendant MOIS is the Ministry of Information and Security, roughly an analog to our CIA but without the rules.

It is a well funded, disciplined and skilled intelligence

1 agency

1cfeter1

agency with an annual budget of somewhere between 100 and 400 million dollars. All three of the Iranian defector witnesses X, Y and Z, are former members of the MOIS. All testify at great length about it. Indeed, witness Z testifies in tremendous length about the structure of MOIS and his career in it.

And I will have more to say about that in just a moment. The predecessor of the MOIS was not SAVAK, which is the Shah's intelligence agency, but rather a nameless intelligence agency created by Ayatollah Khomeini in the early days of the republic which was answerable only to him and assassinated people, dissidents or opponents at his command now. Many of the State Department reports, annual reports on global terrorism over the past 25 years discuss the MOIS as a key facilitator of terrorism throughout the Middle East and the world.

Now, in the 1990s there was a series of domestic murders, dozens of murders of intellectuals, writers, journalists and opponents of the regime. These were known in Iran as the chain murders. This led — when it was discovered publicly, and the information did get out that MOIS was deeply involved, was, in fact, doing the murdering, and that this led to some limited reforms in order to protect certain officials in the government, led to certain limited reforms of the MOIS.

But Ayatollah Khamenei by that point is the defendant

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

in this case. Ayatollah Khamenei was the Supreme Leader by that time.

nameless special intelligence apparatus answerable only to him,

1cfeter1

and he formed a new special intelligence apparatus which has no

name. We call it the Supreme Leader's special intelligence

He then went back to Khomeini's original idea of a

apparatus in our papers. But it reported directly to him and

is completely under his control.

Witness Z testifies at great length about the creation of the special intelligence apparatus, its structure and function and even presents organizational charts showing how the special intelligence apparatus is structured. Witness Z's testimony in that regard is in Exhibit S7 at pages 24 through 40 and includes Deposition Exhibit 6.

Witness X and witness Y also discuss it. And witness Y's testimony, who also was very knowledgable about the special intelligence apparatus, is in Exhibit S6 at pages 6, 14 to 18 and 53 to 54.

Witness X discusses it in S3 at 24 to 39, but that will be unsealed.

Now, beyond the special intelligence force, beyond the IRGC and beyond the MOIS and the Qods Force, and the IRGC's Qods Force, the entire apparatus, the truth is the entire apparatus of the Iranian government and many parts of Iran's private sector, companies, private individuals, all are at the service of the Supreme Leader, the MOIS and the IRGC in the

service and support of terrorism, if they want them to be. Witness X actually testifies a great deal about that in his testimony, and this will be discussed as well a bit later.

Now, the next defendant is an organization Hezbollah. Hezbollah today is the de facto government of Lebanon, but it was created by Iran specifically in the early to mid1980s in a reaction to the Israeli invasion of Lebanon when it sought to drive out the PLO.

But Iran sent its -- the IRGC, Qods Force into Lebanon to create a resistance force. This became Hezbollah. They did it as an extension of the Iranian revolution itself into Lebanon, with aims of going even beyond.

Now, Iran ever since then has been a total sponsor and controller of Hezbollah. Hezbollah is, in fact, an agency and instrumentality of the Iranian government. It is funded by the Iranian government to the tune of 100 to 500 million dollars annually, direct financial support, cash, as well as untold amounts of equipment, weapons and training.

From the beginning, from the very beginning, Hezbollah has served as a terrorist proxy organization for Iran, and the US State Department has so designated it, Hezbollah, as a foreign terrorist organization ever since 1997.

Imad Fayez Mughniyah is a very important player in the facts of this case. Imad Mughniyah, also known as the Hajj
Radwan, was for three decades prior to his assassination in

Damascus, in Syria. In February 2008 he was the terrorist operations chief of Hezbollah. And all that entire time he was an agent of Iran, recruited by Iran specifically for this role.

Mughniyah played a critical role in many -- in a long string of imaginative and high-profile and vicious terrorist attacks across the globe, including many, many terrorist acts directly against United States citizens during the '80s and '90s.

Mughniyah was the central figure what's called the Lebanon hostage crisis of the 1980s. All of the university officials, business people, reporters and CIA agents, prominently, the Beirut station chief in Beirut, William Buckley, all kidnapped by Hezbollah, directed and personally executed in many instances by Imad Mughniyah. William Buckley in particular was tortured to death by Mughniyah at his own hands. He directed the hijacking of a TWA flight in which the Navy diver by the name of Robbie Stidham was murdered and his body dumped on the tarmac of the airport in the 1980s. That was a subject of a federal case, Stidham v. Iran.

Mughniyah's activities in this regard was in part, large part to affect United States policy in the Middle East. The Lebanon hostage crisis, for example, led directly to the Iran-contra affair. The goal of Iran through its agent Hezbollah, the goal was to drive the United States out of the Middle East and to reduce the American presence and influence

throughout the Middle East, which Iran seeks to displace, seeks to take the place of.

Now, Mughniyah himself was on the FBI's Most Wanted List for 21 years until his death. He was personally responsible for two bombings of the United States Embassy in Beirut, Lebanon, in 1983. He was personally responsible for — indeed, took a film of the execution of the truck bombing of the marine barracks in Beirut in 1983. Significant about that is that Mughniyah — and this was his first, the first time he had done it — created and perfected the art, if you will, of simultaneous terrorist acts. In that particular case he truck bombed the marine barracks and the French paratroopers' quarters outside the Beirut airport simultaneously.

By the way, those facts were found in the case of Peterson v. Iran, and Iran and Hezbollah were held legally liable for the marine barracks bombing in 1983.

Now, a popular -- sometimes in the media there's references to the notion that Sunnis and Shias, the two major sects of Islam, they don't get along. They don't work together. They don't deal with each other. That might be true on a street level, but the truth is that that is -- especially when it comes to matters of terrorism, that is a popular misconception. The conventional wisdom is wrong, and the many experts, as Mr. Mellon will describe later, many of our experts debunk that conventional wisdom as being absolutely wrong when

it comes to matters of terrorism.

Indeed, the 9/11 commission report itself stated clearly that the relationship between Al-Qaeda and Iran demonstrated that Sunni/Shia divisions did not necessarily pose an insurmountable barrier to cooperation in terrorist operations. Indeed, the fact is that Iran and Al-Qaeda in particular are ruthlessly pragmatic forces, and they will cut deals with potential adversaries whenever and wherever it will advance their own causes.

Now, Iran in particular, though it is Shiite generally, a Shiite majority nation, has demonstrated it is quite willing to use, coopt and support Sunni people, Sunnis, as their proxies in order to carry out acts of terrorism.

Religious difference, to the extent they even exist at that point on the leadership level, is trumped by the leaders' desire to confront common enemies, particularly the United States and Israel, which are, of course, known as the great Satan and the lesser Satan in Iran and throughout Muslim -- Islamic terrorist organizations.

One of the witnesses in this case is the first elected president of Iran, Abulhassan Banisadr. We took his testimony -- and that is unsealed already -- we took his testimony in France in 2005. Banisadr was a -- as the first elected president, was a fairly moderate person, and he was statesmanlike and wanted to put Iran on a path of a normal

relationship with nations. He was ousted by Ayatollah Khomeini. He had to be smuggled out before he was assassinated. He's lived in exile ever since. Banisadr testified in this case. He said Iran's leaders don't actually care about Islam. What they care about is power.

Now, as part of that, the idea of using Sunnis as proxies, Iran in starting in 1991, 1992, Iran founded a new organization specifically to promote publicly a reconciliation of Sunni and Shia sects of Islam. This dovetailed simultaneously with the ideas and the preachings of the Sudanese political and religious leader Hassan al Turabi. Al Turabi promoted the idea of setting aside the historic bitterness between Sunni and Shia to create a united front against the United States and Israel. He hosted a giant conclave in 1991 of hundreds of mullahs, clerics and hundreds of terrorists who all descended upon Sudan to attend this conclave for this purpose. He established ties to Iran's political leadership and intelligence agencies at that time.

Among the people who was resident in Sudan at that time was Osama bin Laden, as well as Ayman al Zawahiri, who around that time came together to form what we -- solidified what we now know as Al-Qaeda. Bin Laden and Zawahiri accepted this concept, and the leadership of Iran as we know it was already on that path. They all came together during that time frame, and discussions in Sudan between those parties led to an

informal agreement to start to cooperate against the United States and Israel.

Now, when those discussions start, led to the beginnings of exchanges of training where Al-Qaeda operatives were sent to Iran to receive training, particularly in explosives, as well as being sent to Lebanon for training with Hezbollah. This all led to a historic meeting in 1993 in Khartoum, Sudan. This meeting, as we know, was arranged by a man named Ali Mohammed, who now resides in the United States federal prison.

Ali Mohammed is a confessed terrorist. He was a bin Laden bodyguard. He is the fellow who was a member of the United States military for many years but he was exposed, ultimately, and convicted for his part in several terrorist attacks that will be discussed in a few moments.

As part of his plea allocution, Ali Mohammed confessed — or described setting up the meeting, or helped setting up the meeting in 1993 in Khartoum, Sudan. That meeting was attended by Osama bin Laden and Ayman al Zawahiri on behalf of Al-Qaeda, as well as Iran's and Hezbollah master terrorist Imad Mughniyah and a number of very prominent Iranian officials, including the IRGC brigadier general Mohammad Baqr Zolqadr.

This 1993 meeting in Khartoum led to an alliance, an actual alliance between Iran, Al-Qaeda and Hezbollah to jointly

cooperate, support each other and to carry out terrorist acts against the United States and Israel. In particularly significant was that Imad -- up until that time bin Laden's history was that he was a guerilla fighter in Afghanistan. It was Imad Mughniyah who made him into a terrorist, starting then, and he convinced him in particularly, in particular about the effectiveness of suicide bombings in -- that he had demonstrated in the 1980s in the acts that -- previously described, which had the effect basically of getting the United States military out of Lebanon in the mid-'80s. He convinced Bin Laden that this was the right tactic; this was the effective tactic. And that is what bin Laden and al Zawahiri embraced.

This meeting led to ongoing communications, training arrangements and operations among Iran, Hezbollah and Al-Qaeda that continued on throughout the '90s. Bin Laden sent more of his terrorist operatives to Hezbollah training camps that were operated by Mughniyah, both in Lebanon and in Iran, inside Iran. One of those trained was a man named Saif al-Adel, who's become the number three person in Al-Qaeda and the chief of the military operations. And he becomes a significant player in these facts as well, which I will mention in a few moments as well.

Among the Hezbollah training of the Al-Qaeda operatives and the IRGC training of Al-Qaeda was training in

how to bomb large buildings, as well as intelligence and security. One of the others who fit by the way, who coordinated this training, was a man by the name by Majid Kamal. He was an IRGC commander who had performed this training function and this training coordination function at the creation of Hezbollah. He returned for repeat performance then in the '90s assisting in this very same function.

Now, after the terrorist alliance was formed, al Zawahiri repeatedly visited Tehran during and throughout the 1990s, developed relationships with MOIS and IRGC, including the MOIS Chief Ali Fallahian and the Qods Force chief Ahmad Vahidi, both notorious players in many terrorist acts yet to come throughout the '90s. Then the training arrangement continued, coordinated by Imad Mughniyah and the IRGC officers.

The witness Y testified -- witness Y was one of those trainers. And he testifies in great detail about his activities in Lebanon as an IRGC terrorist trainer in his deposition, Exhibit S5, at pages 42 to 52 and 66 through 73.

Witness Z testifies about training camps inside Iran for terrorists that he personally was aware of. Witness Z testifies about S7 at pages 117 to 118.

Witness X testifies to those as well, but, again, that will be unsealed.

Terrorist attacks thereafter -- the formation of the terrorist alliance between these three entities then led to,

1cfeter1

directly to a pattern of terrorist strikes directly against the United States and its allies during the 1990s. In March 1992 Hezbollah terrorist team operated directly under Imad Mughniyah, truck bombed the Israeli embassy in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Many casualties, many killed and wounded. United States National Security Administration, NSA, intercepts of communications from Iranian embassies in Buenos Aires and Brasilia to the foreign ministry in Iran proved beyond doubt that Iran itself was involved in the 1992 attack on the Israeli embassy in Buenos Aires.

Indeed, as our expert, Ronen Bergman, from Israel describes in his affidavit, the proof was unequivocal. It was not a smoking gun but a blazing cannon of proof that Imad Mughniyah and another senior Hezbollah member, Talal Hamiaa, actually executed this terrorist operation.

In July 1994 Mughniyah and a Hezbollah sleeper cell struck again, a follow-up bombing in Buenos Aires, Argentina, when they truck bombed the Asociacion Mutual Israelita Argentina, otherwise known as the AMIA, Jewish cultural center in Buenos Aires. United States investigation, Israeli investigation and Argentina all concluded that Iran, Hezbollah and Imad Mughniyah were responsible for the AMIA bombing.

In fact, the Argentinian investigators determined that the decision was taken at the highest levels of Iran's government. And they indicted nine major officials of Iran,

including Imad Mughniyah, but also including the Supreme

Leader, the defendant Khamenei in this case, and then president

Rafsanjani, also a defendant in this case, among others. The

Argentines then sought the issuance of Interpol red notices for
all nine.

And what followed then was an extraordinary, in fact, unprecedented attempt by Iran to try to block Interpol from issuing red notices for its president and Supreme Leader, as well as the others. After a long battle at Interpol, notices were -- red notices were issued for six. They managed to avoid Khamenei, Rafsanjani and the ambassador to Argentina being sought by Interpol, but as affidavit of Edgar Adamson describes, it was an unprecedented activity at Interpol at that time.

In July 1995, Ayman al Zawahiri's Egyptian gunmen, who were supported trained and funded by Iran, attempted to assassinate Egyptian president Hosni Mubarak in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. That attempt failed. However, what followed was that the IRGC extricated some of the assassins from Ethiopia and arranged for their protection by Hezbollah in Lebanon and for the team leader of that assassination attempt, they protected him. They gave him refuge inside Iran itself.

In May 1996, after extraordinary pressure from the United States and the Saudis and Egyptians, Sudan actually expelled Bin Laden and he relocated to Afghanistan. What's not

generally known about that is that his relocation was materially assisted and coordinated by a Sunni warlord, an Afghan named Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, who is a strong ally -- he's from western Afghanistan. He's a strong ally of Iran -- and that Bin Laden's relocation was accomplished with the direct assistance of the Iranian intelligence services.

Shortly after Bin Laden relocated to Afghanistan was the 1996 truck bombing of the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia. This is the American servicemen's housing complex. A devastating truck bomb killing 19 soldiers and wounded more than 500.

The FBI had been engaged in an unprecedented overseas investigation. The FBI investigators concluded that the Khobar Towers operation was on the direct orders of the Iranian senior government leaders. The bombers were trained and funded by the IRGC in Lebanon. And indeed, the 9/11 Commission looked at this as part of the pattern of Al-Qaeda violence, terrorism, and the 9/11 Commission itself said that it examined CIA documents that established that it was the -- actually, it was the IRGC Qods Force commander Vahidi who planned the Khobar Towers attack, along with Ahmad al Mugassil, who was an Al-Qaeda operative.

A US District Court in Washington, DC, held that Iran was, in fact, factually and legally responsible for the Khobar Towers bombing. That's the Heiser case, vs. Islamic Republic

of Iran, about 2006.

The Al-Qaeda, as you know, was involved in planning, so Iran was as well, but so was Imad Mughniyah. And witness Z testifies of his personal knowledge of Mughniyah's involvement and Iran's involvement in the Khobar Towers bombing. His testimony in Exhibit S7 at pages 100 to 101 and 111 to 112 is specifically about their involvement in the Khobar Towers bombing.

Now, indeed, you know it's known that Bin Laden facilitated shipment of explosives to Saudi Arabia and was, in fact, congratulated on the day of the Khobar Towers bombing on a satellite phone which was intercepted by the United States NSA. Now, just two months later, Osama bin Laden issued his first fatwa against the United States, basically a declaration of war against the United States. And he specifically cites the Khobar Towers bombing as part of his premise for doing that.

Now, so Khobar Towers is very, very clear instance in which the involvement of all three, Hezbollah, Iran and Al-Qaeda, were clearly involved together, acting together.

At that same time in August of 1996 an Iranian intelligence operative who was directly involved in the Khobar Towers bombing visited Osama bin Laden in Jalalabad,

Afghanistan and the subject of a continuing strategic agreement to undertake a joint terrorism campaign against the United

States. And at that same time one of his associates, most dangerous associates, was in contact with Mughniyah's offices in Beirut. And the training and transfer of equipment and material and knowledge between Iran and Hezbollah and Al-Qaeda continued.

On February 23, 1998, just about a year and a half later, Osama bin Laden issued his second fatwa against the United States, calling for the murder of Americans as the individual duty for every Muslim who can do it in any country in which it is possible to do it.

A few months later they struck again. This time it was the United States Embassies in Nairobi, Kenya, and Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania. Hundreds of miles apart, but the truck bombings, which were devastating in nature, were simultaneous, killing hundreds of people and wounding thousands. This type of attack, the simultaneous spectacular truck bombings by suicide bombers against American symbols of power and influence, is the hallmark of Imad Mughniyah. That would be -- United States District Court held just recently, as your Honor indicated a little while ago, in the Owens case, United States District Court held that Iran, IRGC and the MOIS were factually and legally responsible for the US Embassy, twin embassy bombings in 1998.

But there's no doubt that it was all three of these entities, Iran, Hezbollah and Al-Qaeda, who carried it out. It

was, in fact, Al-Qaeda operatives who actually carried out the bombings, were the -- provided the suicide bombers, but they were trained by Hezbollah, as found in the *Owens* case, trained in handling sophisticated explosives. And the *Owens* court found that Iran's leaders were aware of and authorized that training and assistance.

Again, one of those who had been trained in the Hezbollah camps was Al-Qaeda operative Saif al-Adel. Saif al-Adel was convicted in absentia in the United States for his personal role in the twin embassy bombings, and significantly, Saif al-Adel, as we'll see, spent years after 9/11 in safe refuge inside Iran.

Now, the next attack was October 12, 2000. The USS Cole was struck in the harbor of Aden, Yemen, killing 17 sailors and injuring many more. Around just that time a US defense intelligence agency analyst by the name of Kie Fallis was actively alerting his superiors that he had found a web of connections among Al-Qaeda, Iranian intelligence agencies controlled by the Supreme Leader and by Hezbollah, as well as other groups, terrorist groups. Indeed, the 9/11 Commission report states at page 240, it says, quote, that Iran made a concerted effort to strengthen relations with Al-Qaeda after the October 2000 attack on the USS Cole.

But significantly, the same passage of the 9/11 report also states that during this time frame Iranian officials

1cfeter1

facilitated the travel of Al-Qaeda members, including some of the 9/11 attackers, hijackers, through Iran on their way to and from Afghanistan, where they trained at the Al-Qaeda's training camps. Additionally, the types of charges that were used in the USS Cole attack were sophisticated, shaped charges, which is the specialty of Hezbollah as taught to them by the MOIS and IRGC.

That leads me to the specific instances of Iran's active involvement in the 9/11 attacks. First, the concept of Iran and terrorist travel. There are two separate but related ways in which Iran furnished material and direct support for the 9/11 terrorist specific travel operation, just the part of the operation that involved getting the 19 hijackers to the United States. But first they had to go to Afghanistan, where they trained for the mission; in fact, had to meet with Bin Laden himself.

Now, what happened, the first way in which Iran specifically materially supported this travel operation was that Iran facilitated the transit of Al-Qaeda members into and out of Afghanistan in the year prior to 9/11 by ordering its border inspectors not to stamp the passports of the future hijackers as they crossed the international boundary either way into and out of Iran. That enabled the Al-Qaeda hijackers to enter Iran without any record in their passport that they had done so, to enter Afghanistan. They could only do that by

transiting through Iran and not having their passport stamped.

Here was the problem they were addressing. 9/11

Commission, of course, if you take what this says on 240, is it contained evidence 8 to 10 out of the 14 Saudi muscle operatives -- excuse me, of the muscle operatives traveled into or out of Iran between October 2000 and February 2001. The problem was this: That the travel to the training camps in Afghanistan was absolutely essential for the hijackers, because they had to train there and meet with Bin Laden and others.

Absolutely essential for the success of the operation.

But Al-Qaeda knew that the Americans were well aware of the existence of the Al-Qaeda training camps in Afghanistan. During the Clinton years our military had fired cruise missiles into those training camps already trying to get Bin Laden. They knew that we knew where they were.

They also knew that a terrorist operative who was trying to obtain a visa in the United States Embassy or consulate abroad or who was presenting himself for entry, admission at a port of entry into the United States, could be not only discovered and denied entry or denied a visa, but rather, he could be arrested and interrogated and perhaps the entire plot be unraveled if it became known that they had traveled to Afghanistan. Because Afghanistan was already a terrorist state, that alone would have prevented them from getting a passport or being able to enter. And the entire plot

could have come unraveled. Therefore, they needed to be able to enter Afghanistan without any documentary evidence in their passports.

NSA intercepts themselves, which were made available to the 9/11 Commission but were discovered only a few days prior to the report's publication, showed that Iranian border inspectors had been ordered not to tell — put those stamps in the operatives' passports, and that the Iranians were well aware that they knew that — were well aware that they were helping operatives who were part of an organization that was preparing attacks against the United States.

And this could not happen, this could not possibly happen in Iran without senior leadership knowing about it. It is a police state. They control their borders. The MOIS and IRGC control the borders. There are no rogues who are stamping passports. This was unquestionably — and the NSA intercepts proved it. The 9/11 Commission knew and concluded that that's what happened. They simply ran out of time. But when they had to publish, because the commission was going out of existence, they didn't have time to follow up on all of this information, which is why the 9/11 Commission concluded on page 241 that a further investigation is needed. That investigation is the investigation that we have done.

But to return to the travel problem, what is known from the 9/11 Commission investigation was that three

hijackers, at least three, were known -- we had enough of the passports recovered. They were known to be carrying an indicator inside the passport of what the commission reports as Islamic extremism. It was basically some kind -- apparently was some kind of counterfeit stamp or indicator that they were who they were, they were terrorists. These were the guys you're supposed to not stamp their passports. The commission figured that out. They were probably Al-Qaeda calling cards to identify themselves covertly to the border inspectors in Iran.

Therefore, the commission concluded that the actions of the border authorities in Iran, by refraining from stamping the passports of the Saudi hijackers, vastly increased the likelihood of the operational success of the 9/11 plot. That conclusion appears at page 240.

Now, interestingly, it's also known that in the mid-1990s the groundwork for this had been laid by an Al-Qaeda operative Mustafa Hamid, who had negotiated a secret relationship with Iran that had already contemplated this type of safe transit to Afghanistan via Iran, and that passageway was managed by -- was to be managed by the MOIS. This is also a conclusion of the United States government that comes from a United States Treasury Department designation in January 2009. So it was known that they made this arrangement.

This entire arrangement is confirmed by numerous admissions from Al-Qaeda prisoners at Guantanamo who confirmed

the existence of the clandestine Iran/Afghanistan passageway that was managed by MOIS. As Mr. Mellon will describe for you later, many of our experts also contribute valuable insights into this arrangement.

It leads to the second way which Iran actively and materially directed and supported the hijackers' international movements. The commission report specifically finds that in October 2000, a senior operative of Hezbollah visited Iran to coordinate activities there. Excuse me, I misread that.

Quote, in October 2000 a senior operative of Hezbollah visited Saudi Arabia to coordinate activities there. He also planned to assist individuals in Saudi Arabia travelling to Iran during November. A top Hezbollah commander and Saudi Hezbollah contacts were involved.

Further, the 9/11 report says that in November of 2000, a muscle hijacker, one of the muscle hijackers, specifically, Ahmed al Ghamdi, flew to Beirut on the same flight as a, quote/unquote, senior Hezbollah operative.

Further, the report states, in mid-November 2000, three of the muscle hijackers, having obtained US visas, traveled in a group from Saudi Arabia to Beirut and then onward to Iran. An associate of a senior Hezbollah operative was on the same flight that took the future hijackers to Iran.

Finally, the report also states that Hezbollah officials in Beirut and Iran were expecting the arrival of a

group during this exact same time period. The travel of this group was important enough to merit the attention of senior figures of Hezbollah.

The 9/11 hijackers were -- not a single one of them was an important individual. They were all pretty much nobody before 9/11. They were young men who were recruited to engage in this operation. There is no way that their travel would be important enough to merit the attention of senior Hezbollah figures if they weren't, in fact, people who had been recruited for a major terrorist operation.

But most significantly of all, the senior operative of Hezbollah that is referenced on pages 240 and 241 of the 9/11 report, we know, is the master terrorist of Hezbollah and the agent of Iran, Imad Mughniyah. We have presented to the Court evidence that it was, in fact, Imad Mughniyah. The 9/11 Commission report, remember, they wrote these — they had to write these two pages in the last few days before publication, the last few days of the commission's existence, when these NSA intercepts that proved all of this information was discovered. To put Imad Mughniyah's name would have been basically to turn the table over, because he is, without question, he was, without question, the most dangerous terrorist in the world. But it is known that the senior Hezbollah operative was Imad Mughniyah.

Now, because that is true, that means that it's an

agent, a direct and long-time agent of Iran, as well as other Hezbollah officials, senior Hezbollah officials in Lebanon and in Iran had actual foreknowledge of the 9/11 conspiracy. And that much is clear just from pages 240 and 241 of the report.

Our three defector witnesses in this case testify repeatedly about the involvement of Imad Mughniyah in the 9/11 plot. Witness Y testifies at Exhibit S6 at pages 36 to 45. Witness Z testifies in Exhibit S7, pages 43 to 52 and 62 to 90 and 103, as well as 91 to 98. Additionally, important to that is our Exhibits 7 through 10 to witness Z's testimony, which is S7.

Once again, the 9/11 Commission after reviewing this evidence concluded that further investigation of these matters was warranted. Again, this group of lawyers conducted that further investigation, and among the first things that we found was it was important information about the individual Ramzi Binalshibh. Ramzi Binalshibh is — this is in the 9/11 conclusion of the 9/11 report.

Ramzi Binalshibh was a well placed Al-Qaeda operative who was supposed to be one of the pilots on one of the planes, but he was unable to get a United States visa, which he needed to participate directly as a hijacker. So the 9/11 Commission concluded that that's why he wasn't part of it, but instead he became the coordinator, the overseas coordinator for the entire 9/11 operation and a liaison between the Al-Qaeda camps and

Bin Laden and al-Zawahiri in Afghanistan, and in particular, the Hamburg cell of the Mohammed Atta in Germany. So he lived in that apartment with Mohammed Atta, and he was instrumental in the coordination of the entire operation.

Now, what we found in our investigation was that eight months before 9/11 occurred Ramzi Binalshibh went to Afghanistan. This was known. But what was not in the 9/11 report was that Ramzi Binalshibh stopped in Tehran en route to meetings with the Al-Qaeda leaders in Afghanistan in January, February of 2001. This is Exhibit 18. And we received these documents directly from the German federal prosecutors in Karlsruhe, Germany. Those documents show that the stop along the way for Ramzi Binalshibh between Germany via Amsterdam to Afghanistan, he stopped in Tehran in January.

Now, during the time frame that Binalshibh was in Iran or was making that trip, our evidence shows that Iran was hosting a four-day secret meeting of Al-Qaeda terrorists, including Ayman al Zawahiri specifically and Saif al-Adel specifically and many others, as well as the Hezbollah terror chief Imad Mughniyah and many senior Iranian officials, some of whom are named. This is important testimony from Exhibit S7, the testimony of witness Z, pages 73 to 84 of Exhibit S7. So this places Ramzi Binalshibh in Iran at the same time that these meetings occur.

Our investigation also turned up a memorandum of

| 1cfeter1

May 14, 2001. And this is in our proof several times. It is an exhibit to the testimony of witness Z, who testifies to the origin and significance of this document. So also available on the Internet now, and it is the attachment B to the affidavit of Ronen Bergman, which is Exhibit 7.

The May 14, 2001, memorandum was authored by Ali Akbar Nateq-Nouri. Nateq-Nouri was the overseer, the head guy in charge of its Supreme Leader's special intelligence apparatus. And in that memorandum he says that he is speaking through the Supreme Leader. And he shows, he demonstrates quite clearly Iran's and Hezbollah's full awareness of and involvement in Al-Qaeda's plans for an impending terrorist strike against the United States. Needless to say, this is just a few months before 9/11 occurred. That document -- which, again, is publicly available, but if your Honor would review the testimony of witness Z, it is specifically in his testimony. And it's in the exhibits and testified to in detail.

This document has been reviewed and found authentic by the United States and Israeli intelligence, as indicated in Ronen Bergman's affidavit. It was addressed to the head of Iran's intelligence operations, Section 43 of MOIS, Mustafa Pourkanad. It shows Iran's awareness of an upcoming major attack in the United States, and it directly connects Iran and Imad Mughniyah to Al-Qaeda and to the planned attack. It references Iran's, quote/unquote, support for Al-Qaeda's future

plans and cautions to be alert for the possible negative future consequences of this cooperation between Iran and Al-Qaeda. It says, while expanding the collaboration of the fighters of Al-Qaeda and Hezbollah, the Supreme Leader was emphasizing with regard to cooperation with Al-Qaeda that no traces be left that might have negative and irreversible consequences. And that contact should be limited to those already existing with Imad Mughniyah and Ayman al-Zawahiri. A very, very important indication that Iran knew all about and was preparing for potential retaliation from the United States, should Iran's involvement in 9/11 be discovered. At that time it was not, and that's why there was the caution to limit contacts only to Mughniyah, who was the most secretive and skilled of terrorists, and Al-Qaeda's number two, Ayman al-Zawahiri.

Now, as part of the Havlish investigation, your Honor, as we've indicated, we had the testimony of the three former MOIS, and in one case, IRGC Qods Force members X, Y and Z; elaborate testimony covering about 28, 29 hours that was taken in 2005 and 2008 overseas. And your Honor has the videotapes as well as the transcripts and exhibits.

 $\label{eq:witness} \mbox{Witness X has authorized us to reveal his identity,} \\ \mbox{and I want to do so today.}$

Now, this might however, if the Court pleases, this might be a good place for a break before, because I know I've been going a long time. And I sense that this could be a good

time for a break?

THE COURT: Sure. Let me give the court reporter, which I'm most concerned about, let's take a five to ten-minute break.

(Recess)

THE COURT: You can continue.

MR. FLEMING: Thank you.

Your Honor, witness X is Abolghasem Mesbahi.

Abolghasem Mesbahi was an Iranian regime insider from the very beginnings of the Islamic republic, was personally familiar with many of the top regime leaders in the '80s, 1980s and early '90s, was a personal friend from a very early age of Ayatollah Khomeini, was part of his circle, even though Mesbahi was very young.

He was born into a well educated family. His mother was a judge during the reign of the Shah. And he was very well educated, something of a child prodigy, finished school at a very early age, got advanced education in Paris at the Sorbonne, speaks five languages. A very, very, very intelligent person who I think that comes across in his testimony, which your Honor has seen.

He also knew the defendant Ali Akbar Hashemi
Rafsanjani very well, former president of Iran and former
speaker of the Parliament and a key player in the Iran/Iraq
war. And he tells some stories, he relates some stories of his

exposure to Rafsanjani during that time period. Abolghasem

Mesbahi was also a close associate of Saeed Emami, who was the

top -- a very top official, the number two official in the

MOIS.

Mesbahi himself held a number of prominent positions in the diplomatic and intelligence organizations of the Iranian regime, even as a very young man, including a position at the Iranian embassy in France shortly after the Islamic republic came into being. But there he was not really a diplomat. He was a spy, and was in charge of espionage for Iran in France until December 1983, when he was expelled by the French government as persona non grata had he been discovered.

He returned to Iran but shortly after returned to western Europe, where he was based in Belgium. And he ran Iran's espionage operations throughout western Europe under a variety of assumed names. Subsequently, Mesbahi played a role in the negotiations on behalf of Iran during the Lebanon hostage crisis of the 1980s. In particular, he was deeply involved in the negotiations surrounding a German hostage named Rudolf Cortés, as he testifies. Mesbahi returned to Iran in the mid-'80s, 1984, '85, to work on the creation of the new intelligence service, MOIS.

Now, during the mid1980s Iran's government believed that its best hope in case of a war with the United States, which was always possible -- remember that the four-day Iran

hostage crisis had only ended a few years before. And there were so many -- including the bombings in Lebanon and so forth that we've already discussed. The possibility of the war with the United States was ever present.

But Iran knew that it could not win a conventional, head-to-head military confrontation with the United States. Therefore, Iran concluded that its best hope to defeat the United States in case of some kind of a military confrontation was to engage in unconventional or asymmetrical warfare strategies. Therefore, it formed a task force of MOIS agents and IRGC officers that was tasked with creating contingency plans for asymmetrical warfare against the United States.

Indeed, the State Department, the State Department itself became aware of this. And in one of the US State Department reports we point out in our brief, the State Department observed that Iran began formulating contingency plans for anti-US terrorist operations in the mid to late 1980s.

In 1985/1986 timeframe Abolghasem Mesbahi worked with the MOIS/IRGC task force that was creating contingency plans for asymmetrical warfare against the United States. That task force, as Mesbahi testifies in this case, devised contingency plans which were aimed at breaking the backbone of the United States economy, crippling or disheartening its will to fight, breaking the resistance of the United States government and its

people or their appetite for war with Iran and disrupting the American economic social, military and political order, all, if it could risk a head-to-head military confrontation. Mesbahi described it as a breaking plan.

The contingency plan's code name was Shaitan dar Atash, which in Farsi means Satan in fire or Satan in hell.

Now, among the other things, the Shaitan dar Atash plan, it had many components, but first, some of the tactics that were conceived of and designed were tactics such as chemical weapons and radioactive dirty bombs, to be deployed in American cities, bombing electrical power plants, as many as possible, bombing gas stations, which have, of course, you know, lots of fuel, explosive fuel right on site, bombing oil — attacking, bombing oil tankers by the hundreds, even the trucks that go along the highways, destroying the railroads.

But it also involved, among all those other things, the planning group devised a scheme to crash hijacked Boeing 747 aircraft into major American cities. Specifically and principally and always first among the targets were the cities of New York and Washington, DC, as well as Chicago. In fact, as Mesbahi testified, the contingency plan to hijack Boeing 747 aircraft were actually, was targeted — specifically, among other potential targets, were the World Trade Center in New York, the White House in Washington and Pentagon, the Pentagon in Virginia, just across the river from Washington.

Now, the Shaitan dar Atash plan specifically was focused on Boeing 747 aircraft for a reason: They're the largest major airplanes being used at the time. They were the focus of the IRGC and MOIS task force for aircraft hijackings precisely because their large fuel tanks made them suitable for crashing them into high value targets, such as the World Trade Center or the Empire State Building in New York or the White House or the Pentagon.

Mesbahi himself was part of the group that devised these contingency plans which existed in Iran, in the military intelligence circles of Iran since the mid to late 1980s; again, contingency plans not necessarily to be used at that time, were not used at the time, but they were planned and ready.

Now, Mesbahi himself fell into disfavor with certain hard line elements of the Islamic regime. And as is often happens in Iran, when you fall out of favor with hard line elements in the regime, Mesbahi was arrested and imprisoned several times. And after his release the last time he was banned from government, official government positions.

So he started a private business, but he still became -- because as I noted previously, individuals and private corporations are always at the beck and call of the intelligence service when it comes to matters of terrorism.

Mesbahi continued to be called upon by MOIS to perform duties

related to intelligence and terrorism support. So he was called upon to use his private business as a cover for those activities.

He describes in his testimony working with MOIS front companies involved in transactions such as Iraqi oil sales using reflagged oil tankers. He describes working on the importation of supercomputers and on weapons procurement deals and all kinds of other transactions.

Now, in 1996 Mesbahi was told by his colleague and friend, Saeed Emami, who was then the number two official at MOIS, he was told that he had been targeted — he had been put on a death list, that he was targeted for imminent assassination by his enemies within the regime, the people who didn't like him or like his attitude particularly with regard to his somewhat moderate stance on relations with the West.

So Mesbahi fled Iran, based on the tip from Saeed Emami. And he describes how Emami came to his house in the middle of the night to tell him he was going to be killed. So he left everything he had behind and he fled. And he made his way — got outside of Iran, where he obtained a United Nations refugee card, and ultimately made his way to Germany.

Mesbahi has been living in hiding in Europe ever since. But in Germany, he became an informant for the German Bundeskriminalamt, roughly the German equivalent of the FBI. And he was placed in a German witness protection program. He

became a very important informant and witness for the Germans. And at that time he testified anonymously as witness C in the German prosecution of the Iranian-backed assassins of the Kurdish leaders at the Mykonos restaurant in Berlin in September 1992, which I referred to earlier. That German court relied heavily on Mesbahi's testimony in convicting all of the defendants, including the Iranian coordinator, and specifically finding defendant Rafsanjani and defendant Khamenei as having ordered the assassination of those Kurdish dissidents.

Mesbahi was witness C. He was the critical witness in the Mykonos prosecution. He was introduced to the Court, in fact, by another witness in that case, and a witness who's also a witness in this case, and that is Abolhassan Banisadr, the first president of Iran who testified in this case as well.

The Mykonos trial, as I said, resulted in the convictions of all the defendants. And it led to the German arrest warrant being issued for the MOIS chief Ali Fallahian. The trial exposed the inner workings of the MOIS and the role of the Supreme Leader and the president in matters of terrorism. It also led to an international incident in which the nations of Western Europe withdrew their ambassadors from Iran and suspended what was at that time called the critical dialogue, which was an attempt to gain some kind of international dialogue with Iran. It was all suspended and the ambassadors were withdrawn for a period of time.

But the Mykonos trial also led other European and ultimately South American investigators to try to work with Mesbahi to help them in their prosecutions of terrorists for terrorist attacks that occurred in their countries. And Mesbahi became one of the most important witnesses for western prosecutors who were attempting to prosecute Iranian-backed terrorists.

Among those prosecutions was the AMIA bombing in Buenos Aires in 1994, which I described a little while ago. It resulted in indictments of nine top Iranian officials and Interpol red notices for six of them, including the master terrorist of Hezbollah, Imad Mughniyah.

This also, the AMIA bombing, the AMIA prosecution heavily relied on the assistance of Abolghasem Mesbahi. Parenthetically, another person who was involved was another witness in this case, Kenneth Timmerman, who's in the courtroom here today and was an instrumental part of the Havlish investigation team.

What's important about that, it will become apparent in a moment, because what happened to Mesbahi was this: Before he left Iran, being well versed in code methodology as a top Iranian spy, the head of espionage in all western Europe, before he left Iran, he established code methodologies with some of his trusted friends. Principally among us, he knew that — he knew a lot of state secrets. And he knew they

wanted to kill him, so he was very concerned that if a death squad went overseas, that his friends be able to alert him.

Remember that in the 1980s some 200 Iranian dissidents were assassinated in western Europe. Mesbahi knew this, so he established a set of codes to which he could communicate with trusted friends inside the Iranian government thereafter.

That led to the summer of 2001. And on July 23, 2001, as he was accustomed, Mesbahi checked the places in which he received coded messages. He describes a number of ways in which he did receive coded messages from inside Iran, but one of them was through the newspapers, Iranian newspapers, where a code -- where he could -- where he could look -- read a published newspaper and find a coded message embedded therein.

On July 23, 2001, Mesbahi received just such a coded message from one of his trusted friends. When he decoded the message, he saw that the message was three words: Shaitan dar Atash, Satan in hell, Satan in fire. But more importantly, it was the name of the contingency plan for asymmetrical warfare against the United States that he was a part of the creation.

Mesbahi knew that this coded message meant what it meant, because he was — of his work on that task force. And he knew that it must have meant that the Shaitan dar Atash plan was being activated somehow, but he still didn't know which aspect of it was. Was it the airliners or was it the oil tankers; the electrical power plants, the railroads? He didn't

know.

But he knew it was serious, so he contacted his former handlers when he was in the witness protection program. He met them and told them that he had received this message. He said a big event is going to happen in the United States, a huge terrorist operation, and he asked them to convey the information to higher authorities. The officers said they would convey the information, and they'd let him know what would happen next.

But three weeks later, on August 13, 2001, Mesbahi received another coded message from his source in Iran, clarifying that the Shaitan dar Atash contingency plan that was being activated was the plan to crash hijacked civilian airliners into American cities. Again, Mesbahi contacted the German police officers that he knew or the LKA, Landeskriminalamt, which is more of a local police, cut in, told them about the message, pleaded with them for action. Again, they conveyed the message to higher authorities and said they would get back to him if there were further developments. And Mesbahi emphasized that lives were at risk.

They didn't get back to him, and two weeks additionally passed. And Mesbahi received a third coded message on August 27, 2001. That third message confirmed the activation of the Shaitan dar Atash plan but added important information that somehow Germany was involved in the facts; not

that Germany was part of it, but, rather, that something, the name of Germany was in the reports that his friend and contact in Iran knew. So he knew that somehow there was something going on in Germany that was related to the Shaitan dar Atash plan.

It is now known in the 9/11 Commission report quite clearly that Mohammed Atta, Ramzi Binalshibh, Al-Qaeda terrorist cell that headed the 9/11 attacks was, in fact, based in Hamburg, Germany.

Now, on September 11, 2001, Mesbahi saw with the rest of the world that the attacks had taken place. He desperately tried to reach the LKA officers that he knew, and he tried to contact people he knew in the Bundeskriminalamt, but in Germany, just like in the United States, chaos rang. He wasn't able to get through to anybody.

A couple of days later he was able to and to reach them and was able to speak with some people, but his information — it's not clear what happened to his information at that point. But after 9/11, as is set forth in great detail in his testimony, he made repeated efforts to try to convey his inside information to German and American governmental authorities, German authorities in the law enforcement area in Germany and American government authorities at the embassy. He was generally unsuccessful.

However, one person that he was able to contact was a

1 Dr. Al

1cfeter1

Dr. Akbar Ganji. He was an Iranian dissident in the United States, and Dr. Ganji put Mesbahi in touch with Kenneth Timmerman, who is an Iran expert and investigative journalist, a well known authority in the United States and a person who has actively tried to help the Iranians shake off the yolk of the repressive regime of the mullahs for the last 20 years, an author of many books on the subject and many, many articles in the press, well known to the Iranian exile regime — excuse me, Iranian exile community in the United States and abroad.

Mesbahi succeeded in calling Kenneth Timmerman in September 2001. He told Ken Timmerman about the coded messages. And what is significant about that in particular is that the way Mesbahi related his information about the coded messages was exactly the same as he testified years later in 2008.

Now, another subject in had which Mesbahi had received information from his sources inside Iran was that he learned that Iran had purchased in 2000, Iran had purchased an aircraft flight simulator through a Chinese company called Fuktad which is based in Taiwan with which MOIS had relations. And Mesbahi knew about that. Fuktad had obtained a simulator from AVIC, the Aviation Industries Corporation of China, which is a state-owned entity. Then the simulator was transported to Iran in 2000 by an IRGC front company called Safiran. Safiran was a company that was frequently used for clandestine procurement

and transportation operations by the MOIS and the IRGC, and Mesbahi knew about that, too.

Now, finally, that simulator was set up with computer software to program the module to simulate Boeing 757, 767 and 777 aircraft, and that software was purchased through, as Mesbahi testified, purchased by MOIS through East China Airlines. And the flight simulator for Boeing 757, 767, 777 aircraft was set up in a secure, secret facility at Doshen Tappeh air base near Tehran.

Each of the four airliners that was hijacked on September 11, 2001, and used in the 9/11 attacks were either Boeing 757 or Boeing 767 model aircraft. But Iran has never owned a single Boeing 757, 767 or 777 aircraft, and that's due to American trade sanctions against Iran that prohibit it from buying aircraft from Boeing or from any company selling Boeing aircraft. They've never had a single Boeing aircraft, and yet they had the flight simulator for that aircraft. Those are the aircraft that were, in fact, used, were hijacked on 9/11.

And when Mesbahi called Ken Timmerman in Washington in September 2001, he also told that story, relayed that exact information to Ken Timmerman in September 2001. It didn't change. His testimony did not change. It's beyond belief.

And Ken Timmerman is a personal witness to that. He could not have hatched any such story unless he actually had the information that he was saying. It would have been a

preposterous thing to do. So he didn't make it up. He didn't tell the story the first time in 2008, when we took his testimony. He told it to Ken Timmerman in September 2001.

Now, additionally, Mesbahi learned from his sources one other important fact about the 9/11 hijackers, and that was that at least one of them he knew by name, Majid Moqed, was a muscle hijacker on American Flight 77 that hit the North tower of the World Trade Center, had been identified and was being housed in the months before 9/11, had stayed at a IRGC/MOIS safe house called the Hotel Sepid in Tehran, where Mesbahi himself had used, Mesbahi himself had used as an MOIS safe house. That is some of the more important testimony, some of the most important testimony from Abolghasem Mesbahi.

Now, I want to address also what occurred after 9/11, and that is that Iran provided safe haven to Al-Qaeda after the 9/11 attacks in several significant ways. Most importantly, it provided safe haven to Al-Qaeda leaders and operatives by the hundreds, keeping them safe from retaliation of the United States forces which had invaded Afghanistan in the fall of 2001. Hundreds of Al-Qaeda operatives and leaders and their families somehow managed to escape US invasion by entering Iran. That can't happen by accident.

In fact, it is known that the IRGC facilitated their exit into Iran, and they then provided them safe quarters and everything from financial services, food, medical services,

everything they needed to live safely. It is known that the Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, the same person who helped Bin Laden relocate with the assistance of the IRGC, relocate from Iran to Afghanistan, now had helped the Al-Qaeda cadres fleeing Afghanistan, helped them get into Iran, as did Imad Mughniyah, as did the Iranian Qods Force commander Ahmad Vahidi.

Among the high level Al-Qaeda officials who arrived in Iran from Afghanistan at that time were Sa'ad bin Laden and the man who would soon lead Al-Qaeda in Iraq, Abu Mussab Zarqawi. This is particularly important because these are very, very important people in Al-Qaeda. And they were allowed to come into Iran to escape the Americans, and they were allowed to stay there. In fact, Sa'ad Bin Laden had directed Al-Qaeda terrorist activities thereafter for many years.

Two of the witnesses in this case, the sealed witnesses, Z and Y, both were involved in that evacuation and provision of safe haven. Witness Z testifies -- well, excuse me. Witness Z testifies to assistance to Sa'ad bin Laden prior to 9/11 -- excuse me, I misspoke -- at S7, 84 to 90, pages 84 to 90. Witness Y testifies in detail, because he was very much involved in the support for the escaping Al-Qaeda operatives at S6, Exhibit S6, pages 29 to 31, 35 to 45, or excuse me, 35 to 52.

This does not all come from their testimony, though.

The United States Treasury designations and State Department

1cfeter1

words show very clearly that the United States knows beyond any doubt that Iran helped the Al-Qaeda cadres escape into Iran and that they were provided safe haven thereafter. This is an established conclusion of the United States government.

Indeed, the treasury designations report that Ayman al Zawahiri himself made particularized arrangements for his own family for safe haven in Iran after 9/11 through his son-in-law, who was an Al-Qaeda operative, and that Sa'ad Bin Laden facilitated the travel of Osama bin Laden by Bin Laden's own family members from Afghanistan to Iran.

Now, finally, there have been -- as I mentioned, there has been many instances of those Al-Qaeda operatives in Iran living in safe haven, actually conducting terrorist activities throughout the Middle East and directing them from their refuge in Iran.

Most recently, your Honor, in July of this year, the Obama administration and the US treasury department took actions indicating that even to this day Iran has been materially assisting Al-Qaeda by facilitating the transport of money and terrorist recruits across Iran's territory. The government, our government, concluded that there is an agreement between Al-Qaeda and the Iranian government demonstrating that Iran is a critical transit point for funding of Al-Qaeda activities currently going on in Afghanistan and Pakistan. It's the core pipeline that they move money and

operatives across the Middle East to South Asia. And the Obama administration was very clear in announcing this, that senior Iranian officials know all about these money transfers and that they allow the movement of these Al-Qaeda foot soldiers through Iran's territory.

That concludes my presentation of the evidence. Thank you, your Honor, for giving me the time to do that and being so attentive. I know it took quite a while, but thank you.

And I want to turn it back over to Thomas Mellon for additional presentation.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Mellon?

MR. MELLON: Thank you.

Your Honor, I'd just like to add a footnote to what Mr. Fleming said with regard to Mesbahi. In the 9/11 Commission report, which was released in July of 2004, the testimony of Mesbahi may be put in better context because the 9/11 report chapter 8 is entitled, The System was Blinking Red.

On page 256 it states that the CIA notified all the stations in the summer of 2001 about intelligence suggesting a possible Al-Qaeda attack on US targets over the next few days. The point there being, your Honor, chapter 8 talks just not about Mesbahi, which it doesn't mention at all, but apparently there was an onslaught of information, frequent but fragmentary reports from around the world about a possible attack on

America.

1cfeter1

The context I'm trying to place Mr. Mesbahi in is he's not a gadfly or one in a million or one in ten million.

Mr. Mesbahi was very well placed, very knowledgable, but he was one of, apparently, many, many, many Al-Qaeda leaks in the world, from Malaysia and other places around the world, suggesting something was happening. Something was big. It's going to happen in the summer. And the details were never as specific, of course, as we would like, or we would have prevented it. But, again, Mesbahi is one of many individuals, according to the 9/11 Commission report, that had some fragmentary knowledge of what it is that was going to happen.

Your Honor, it is my responsibility on behalf of the Havlish plaintiffs to discuss the experts. I believe I can do so in 30 minutes. I will do my best by now identifying them and stating that which is the most important part of some of their very lengthy depositions.

By way of introduction, the plaintiff's experts are Dietrich Snell, a 9/11 Commission staff member, more to come; Dr. Daniel L. Byman, also of the 9/11 Commission, more to come; Ms. Janice Kephart, also of the 9/11 Commission; Dr. Patrick Clawson, who is no stranger to our federal courts here in the Southern District of New York or in Washington; Dr. Ronen Bergman, an Israeli national security analyst. We also have the testimony of two CIA street operatives who became, in fact,

supervisors, Clare Lopez and Dr. Bruce Tefft. We have the testimony and the affidavit of Mr. Ken Timmerman, who's been identified in the courtroom already. Then we have Interpol in charge of the United States, Mr. Edgar Adamson. And then finally, a French jurist by the name of Jean-Louis Bruguiere, who has sat on more terrorism trials in Europe than any other, for example -- Judge, I believe it's more than all the French judges combined, a man very knowledgable about terrorism for the last 30 years.

Your Honor, I'd like to begin, then, with the affidavit, which can be found at the lower right-hand corner of your PowerPoint, 159 to 160, specifies these proposed findings of fact, findings of fact that, indeed, are more elaborate as to the affidavit.

But first what I'd like to advise the Court is that Dietrich Snell was the team leader. He was in charge for the United States of America for the 9/11 Commission. He was the team leader of the plot investigation. I doubt that there's anyone more knowledgable in the country than Dietrich Snell as to the entire conspiracy.

In his affidavit, your Honor, he states that he looked at classified and unclassified information in the performance of his responsibility to understand the entire plot. And not only was he in charge of it, but he drafted and edited the 9/11 Commission report on the entire conspiracy, with special

emphasis, on page 240 and 241, Iran, Hezbollah and Al-Qaeda.

And what he tells us is that the FBI had its largest investigation in its history. And it was called the PENTTBOM investigation: "pen" as in Pentagon; "TT", Twin Towers; "bom", bombing. He worked very closely with the FBI in the entirety of the 9/11 Commission report.

And here is what they determined: The FBI view was that the hijackers transited Iran to and from Pakistan and to and from Afghanistan. And this is most important, your Honor: Just not vacation travel; the FBI determined the hijackers were not there as students or tourists; they were there in furtherance of the conspiracy, according to our FBI. And this explains the absence of travel documents.

When you have the largest collection of FBI agents on one case in the world, we all wonder why documents are absent. Well, they're absent, as we heard earlier, and we'll hear a little bit later, it was by design. The documents were not absent by lack of intent. They were intended not to be utilized.

However, Dietrich Snell is a very experienced, highly regarded prosecutor. And he didn't want to write that without further corroboration. So he went to the FBI and the CIA and said, I have to have some questions answered. I want to know what Ramzi Binalshibh in Guantanamo and I want to know what Khalid Sheikh Mohammed in Guantanamo say about this. We're not

going to show our cards. We're just going to ask them some questions. And lo and behold, the answers came back from Binalshibh and Mohammed that Iran was corroborating travel facilitation into and out of and through Iran. And again, these points are found in our proposed findings of fact 160, 161, but of course in those findings of fact we cite extensively the other information in the brief in its entirety.

Next slide please.

This, your Honor, we believe carries the day. As the Court may know, there have been other cases against Iran. In fact, there's been 45 cases against Iran in this country in the last 15 years for terrorism, 45 in federal courts, and some of them just have one expert or some have two. We have ten, and we did that because of the seriousness of the charges.

But this statement from the person who wrote the book on the 9/11 conspiracy, I believe, establishes our legal burden. And here are his words, your Honor: There is clear and convincing evidence pointing to the involvement on the part of Hezbollah and Iran in the 9/11 attack, especially as it pertains to travel facilitation and safe haven.

(Continued on next page)

MR. MELLON: Your Honor, I believe we have already moved the affidavit in its entirety for Dietrich Snell into evidence, but to the extent it hasn't been, I want to do it again for insurance purposes.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. MELLON: The next person, your Honor, we believe is equally compelling in this is Dr. Daniel L. Byman.

Dr. Byman was again a member of the 9/11 Commission. Who better to think about these important issues and the interrelationships between Iran, al~Qaeda and Hezbollah.

Dr. Byman is a professor at Georgetown University specializing in terrorism. His résumé is so impressive, your Honor, which is why I put it here in terms of his credibility.

He's a member of the Brookings Institute. He's a regular consultant to the United States Government on terrorism and national security matters. He spent years in the CIA before his Georgetown days. He was the research director of the RAM Center for the Middle East public policy. This is interesting, your Honor, respectfully, he was on both the House and Senate Intelligence Committees investigation into the attack, which was called "The 9/11 Inquiry" and then, of course, "The 9/11 Commission." Dr. Byman has seen it all. In fact, his specialty is al Qaeda. Next one, please.

Your Honor, here is what Dr. Byman says: He too says there is clear and convincing evidence that Iran has provided

material support for al Qaeda. The support included assistance with travel, unlimited safe haven and training, at the very least. Next, please.

Dr. Byman explained to us that the main reason for the cooperation between Iran and al Qaeda is that both see -- Iran and al Qaeda -- both see the United States as its enemy. Both believe the United States is an imperialistic power bent on subjugating Muslims and want to weaken the United States' influence.

Here is a very powerful statement: Dr. Byman says, "The use of violence and the threat of force have been part of Iran's foreign policy," leaving no doubt.

He also mentions that al Qaeda leader Ayman al-Zawahiri has admitted publicly in Middle Eastern newspapers that before 9/11, Iran and al Qaeda cooperated together. As part of their cooperation, Iran used Hezbollah as a facilitator and, of course, the number one facilitator for terrorism in the world is Imad Mughniyah.

In fact, Dr. Byman writes that the relationship between Hezbollah and Iran has one of the closest relationships in history between a terrorist group and its sponsors. He said, however, there's another reason for this Iranian—al Qaeda connection: That reason is that Hezbollah offers Iran deniability, deniability. Next, please.

Dr. Byman notes that keeping passports clean was

vital -- and that is his word, your Honor -- vital to reducing the risk of discovery and arrest.

One of al Qaeda's key military commanders, Seif al-Adl, acknowledged transit through Iran has been publicly stated again in Middle Eastern newspapers. The source of this information again goes back to the actual affidavit, which in turn actually notes specific publications and the source.

Dr. Byman notes that travel assistance is invaluable, his words, and here is why: With travel assistance, al Qaeda is able to make recruits and acquire easier training, and, most importantly, al Qaeda is enabled to have better communication and coordination among its ranks.

So, Dr. Byman is a 9/11 expert who recognizes that travel assistance is indispensable and indeed invaluable.

Al Qaeda received training in explosives in Iran leaving little question open on that point. Next one, please.

Iran's standard modus operandi is outsourcing to its close ally Hezbollah. I believe Mr. Fleming has certainly touched upon that and made that clear. The training that Iran has provided Hezbollah — think Imad Mughniyah — involves explosives on methods pertaining to the collection of intelligence and operational security. It's just not a matter of travel facilitation and it's just not a matter of safe haven.

He concludes that there is strong support for the

claim that Iran has provided important material support for al Qaeda, and that support comes from a range of sources; again, including U.S. Government documents and even statements by al Qaeda themselves.

Your Honor, our third expert -- and I will try to speed this up, but I think this is another terribly important expert because she worked for the 9/11 Commission. This is our third person who worked for the 9/11 Commission.

Janice Kephart was their border control expert. She was the person who was responsible for understanding the ingress and egress of the hijackers. Previously, she was counsel to the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee. She served on the 9/11 Commission.

Here is a fact that most of the American public doesn't even know exists. There is a companion book -- it's pretty thick -- to the 9/11 Commission, and it's called "9/11 and Terrorist Travel." It's a staff report of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks. It's a companion to the 9/11 Report and it's all about travel, in and out, and as we will see, there are some really revealing facts.

First of all, Janice Kephart teaches us, instructs us that the 9/11 travel was an operation. It was like a military operation. It was similar to the coordination of going to the four planes, having them take off at the same time, having their targets identified and executing it.

Janice Kephart's affidavit says: The travel operation -- the planning, the execution, the timing, the manner and means -- was just as important as driving the airplanes, and that it takes an enormous amount of work.

In fact, she tells us that in her job she interviewed many folks, including thousands of travel documents, but, please, your Honor, listen to this one, rather unbelievably, she actually has six of the hijacker passports. It's hard to believe that of the inferno that was 9/11 that six passports could survive, but among the thousands of documents that she examined in writing her companion terrorist travel book, she found — not she, but our country found — six of the hijackers' actual passports. Go back for a second, please.

She interviewed in detail each one of the 26 U.S. border inspectors who were involved in the ingress and egress of the travel of the hijackers.

Her conclusion is as an expert: The facilitation of terrorist travel is crucial, crucial material support to terrorist operations.

And second conclusion: Iran's facilitation of al Qaeda operative travel, including at least eight of the hijackers, amounted to essential material support, indeed, direct support, your Honor, direct support, that removes all doubt, direct support that further enabled al Qaeda to perpetuate the 9/11 attack successfully. Next slide, please.

Your Honor, slide 58, the 9/11 terrorists had engaged in a specific terrorist travel operation, which I discussed before, and, again, it was not only the seizure of the airlines but the execution. For terrorists' travel, success is often dependent on preparation. In fact, look what the 9/11 Commission said -- not just Janice Kephart -- the 9/11 Commission said, "For terrorists, travel documents are as important as weapons." Again, that's not just Janice; that's the 9/11 Commission. Next one, please.

Janice's affidavit notes that 26 of the al Qaeda terrorist operatives were whittled down to 19. In her investigation, along with other members of the border team, 23 visas were applied for resulting in 22 visas being obtained for 34 separate entries into and out of the United States. I shouldn't say out of. I should say into. 34 separate entries into the United States. Over a period of 21 months. In other words, the hijackers didn't have much of a problem getting into our country.

Now, why is that important? Well, Ms. Kephart tells us why. They must travel clandestinely to meet, to train, to plan, to case targets and to gain access for the actual attack itself. To terrorists, international travel presents a great danger because of passing through regulated channels.

Although, again, as noted, they were successful many, many, many times before 9/11.

This is Janice's conclusion on PowerPoint 60. Again, the words are used: "There is clear and convincing evidence that Iran and Hezbollah provided material support to al Qaeda by actively facilitating the travel of eight to ten of the 9/11 hijackers to Iran or Beirut" -- importantly -- "immediately after their acquisition of their U.S. visas." They got to Saudi Arabia, they got their visas, and back they went, and then into Afghanistan, "and that these U.S. visas" -- this we believe is very important, your Honor -- were specifically acquired, "garnered specifically for the purpose of terrorist travel into the United States to carry out the 9/11 attacks."

So we have, once again, Imad Mughniyah rendering assistance to these hijackers, these young men, Imad Mughniyah takes them from Iran to Saudi Arabia, when they get clean visas and their clean passports, back to Iran, then back to Afghanistan. Next slide, please.

Your Honor, Dr. Patrick Clawson, certainly one of the foremost experts on Iranian terrorism. He's a constant consultant to the CIA, the DIA, the National Security Agency, the Defense Department. He has lectured worldwide on the subject matter of Iran.

However, perhaps of interest to this Court, Patrick Clawson has been an expert witness 25 times in our federal courts on the subject of Iran and terrorism, many times in Washington, but I believe a few times here in New York.

Patrick Clawson chose to draft his affidavit in a fashion that he thought would be most compelling to the Court. He believed the fact that the U.S. State Department annual reports are the most telling documents.

Here is why: Those reports are not issued unless every facet of the U.S. Government edits and agrees to the exact wording and content. So it's just not the State

Department putting together a report for one or two bureaucrats to keep themselves busy; this is heavily vetted by our whole intelligence community.

Dr. Clawson said, Iran is consistently from the early Eighties, '81, cited as the primary state sponsor of terrorism throughout the world. There's no second place. It's all about Iran. That's been true now for all those many years.

He states that the U.S. Government sources have issued repeated and detailed descriptions of Iranian material support to al Qaeda before, during, and after 9/11.

Now, we know that the State Department is not the only one that issues reports. The U.S. Treasury often issues reports involving terrorism. U.S. Justice Department. There are many departments of our government that issue reports. His statement is that U.S. Government sources have issued repeated and detailed descriptions of Iranian material support.

He states, "Noting the evidence is clear and convincing, there is simply no ambiguity or unclarity in U.S.

government statements about this matter.

Of recent vintage, Dr. Patrick Clawson thought it was important for this Court to know that Sa'ad bin Laden went directly to Iran after the 9/11 attacks, and as we'll see coming up in a moment, managed al Qaeda from inside Iran. Next please.

We are at slide 64, I believe. In fact, Dr. Clawson really became emphatic. I was going to say strident, but that would be unkind. He became emphatic when he said, "Few, if any, noted terrorism experts would dispute that Iran provides material support to al Qaeda within the meaning of 18 U.S.C., which is the definition of material support I read in the very beginning today.

Iran supported al Qaeda through its instrumentalities, the Revolutionary Guard and MOIS, is consistent with its foreign policy of supporting terrorism against the United States. Yes, it's their foreign policy to support terrorism against us. Next.

That concludes Dr. Clawson, and we are better than halfway done, your Honor.

Your Honor, Claire M. Lopez and Dr. Bruce Tefft are very interesting experts because they earned their spurs on the streets around the world including the Middle East, Europe, Russia, South America, on-the-street CIA people. Then they graduated in their senior year, so to speak, as supervisors

running the other agents around the world. Today they are privately retained by various federal contractors, and, of course, that would be in the area of intelligence and security, and their actual bio in the affidavit is quite extensive; quite, quite extensive.

But I thought of note to this Court, Dr. Tefft has been certified as an expert in our courts, in the United States District Courts, in Washington in eight different cases involving Iran.

Now, your Honor, you may recognize this from my introductory comment about material support. In my introductory comment, I mentioned that all of these things, and to a significant degree, have been contributed by Iran via Hezbollah to al Qaeda.

Dr. Tefft and Claire Lopez write: Their material support involves planning, recruitment, training, financial services, expert advice and assistance. Iran provided al Qaeda lodging and safe houses. Iran and Hezbollah provided false documents and identification. Iran and Hezbollah provided communication equipment, facilities, weapons, lethal substances, explosives. And, finally, Iran and al Qaeda, or, I should say, Iran and Hezbollah provided al Qaeda with personnel and travel facilitation.

On slide 67, We have seen this by way of Mr. Fleming's prior presentation. I hope it is now clear that 8 to 14 muscle

hijackers acquired their needed Saudi passports and their needed U.S. visas thus ensuring two things: If you have a clean Saudi passport and a clean U.S. visa, that guarantees your continued training in Afghanistan but access to the United States.

Slide 68, your Honor. I believe Mr. Fleming made a very clear statement, but I feel compelled to do it again. The Iranian and al Qaeda joint terror attacks against the United States on September 11, 2001 were preceded by the Khobar Towers in Saudi Arabia, by the two embassy bombings in Africa in 1998, and the suicide bombing on the Destroyer Cole in 2000.

I respectfully submit, I respectfully submit that the history demonstrates that something else was going to happen in 2000, or 2001 or 2002. This conspiratorial relationship had not ended but had just started, and to our great sadness, the next thing was September 11.

Slide 69, your Honor. "We are convinced that the overwhelming evidence assembled in our affidavit, which is several hundred paragraphs, leaves no doubt that al Qaeda and the official Iranian regime at the highest levels have been acting in concert to plot and execute attacks against the United States since the early 1990s."

Slide 70, your Honor. They concluded upon that which I commented upon a moment ago; that is, al Qaeda and Iran, and every time we see Iran, we think Hezbollah. Hezbollah is Iran;

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Iran is Hezbollah. Alliance was responsible for all of the most significant terrorist attacks against the U.S. national interests from 1990s up to and including September 11.

Your Honor, these are brand new slides. We just got permission from Mr. Mesbahi to mention his name and to tell the Court what he knew. So these slides are less than a day old. These slides suggest that Ayatollah Khomeini initiated contingency plans in the mid 1980s for an operation against the United States in the American cities called Shaitan dar Atash.

Here is why that is important. In their affidavits, in their full affidavits, you will see that Lopez and Tefft were mandated by all the Havlish lawyers to take Mesbahi's full testimony and to break it down. Frankly, your Honor, we don't know whether to believe him or not. What do we know. So, we gave him the testimony and the videos. They took six months to study the videos and the testimony, and in their full affidavit -- and this is a shorthand of it -- they say, from our point of view as CIA, it's all credible. It's real. If we were in the CIA today and he came and talked to us, we would sit him down and work with him. We, of course, know the Germans did. The important thing is Mesbahi's credibility is bound to be tagged for here are two professionals who have studied it over six months, and they say he's credible with regard to Shaitan dar Atash, and which relates to the operational contingency plans in the mid 90s.

They also took a look in great detail about the coded messages coming in newspapers and other ways from Iran to him in Europe. Of course we said to Lopez and Tefft, how do we know he's telling the truth? They studied the coded messages. They analyzed the coded messages. And here is what they said. They studied his communication sources inside of Iran, the encoded and encrypted messages, and the manner and method of such communication is credible. Mesbahi's testimony that he received from high-level sources in Tehran advance notice of a major attack is credible.

This is the conclusion, your Honor. It is their expert opinion to a reasonable degree of professional certainty that the Iranian regime's use of terror and specifically its material support of al Qaeda and terrorist attacks, including 9/11, is beyond question. And that is slide 73.

Your Honor, in the interest of brevity, I believe I will make this my last one. This will be our last one, your Honor. We are going to cut a couple of the others short.

Your Honor, Dr. Ronen Bergman is an Israel expert on international intelligence, especially the Mossad and terrorism. I think it's generally considered well-known that Mossad is a very excellent intelligence agency, and, very frankly, we went and tried to learn as much as we could in Israel, and several of the men and women in this room made several trips to Israel with that purpose in mind.

On the record the Mossad could not speak to us, on the record the Mossad could not give us anything, but on the record Mossad helped us with Dr. Ronen Bergman, and you will see that.

Again, he's an expert on international intelligence and on Mossad and terrorism. He conducted extensive interviews with many former -- and I found this powerful your Honor -- Iranian intelligence and military personnel. So he's talking to them directly. Again, his affidavit goes into great detail about that. He is considered one of the principal experts on the Israeli intelligence community's assessment or analysis of Iran. And this we found powerful, your Honor: He has reviewed the intelligence material from not only Israel, but the United States, France, United Kingdom, Egypt, Jordan and Germany.

This is a new slide, your Honor. Dr. Bergman has researched and published material about Witness X, Mr. Mesbahi. Here is what he tells us in his affidavit. Mesbahi is known to be an excellent intelligence operative. He tells us, which we know, the Germans recruited Mesbahi as a source of information and evidence. An important asset in the investigation of many assassinations and acts of terror by the Iranian regime and its proxies, Hezbollah, in several countries.

Mesbahi's testimony has been received with high reliability by courts and law enforcement and intelligence agencies worldwide. So, once again, we really don't have to take Mesbahi's word for it. We can rely upon Lopez. We can

rely upon Tefft. And, more important, we can rely upon his access to information involving Mesbahi; that is, Dr. Bergman.

Slide 76. He notes from his intelligence sources that Iran was involved in 133 terrorist operations in just nine years. That's between '87 and '95. He tells us that many other acts of terrorism involving hundreds of fatalities preceded and followed this eight-year period. Of course, that is not including the 2,977 deaths we had on September 11.

Hezbollah, of course, was an Iranian organization from its inception, and of course we now know from Mr. Fleming's presentation that Mughniyah was its leader.

Israeli and American intelligence sources believe that Hezbollah's Mughniyah conceived, designed, planned, commanded and carried out terrorist operations involving hundreds of deaths, more than any other single figure in the world before his own assassination in Damascus, Syria in February '08. Mughniyah and his top lieutenants all trained in Iran.

Slide 78, your Honor. This is, I believe, telling and its a very lengthy affidavit. We wanted to highlight that Dr. Bergman had access to two top-secret highly classified Israeli documents. I asked him is it OK for us to say that? Are we allowed to say that? He said, yes, you can put it in. And he did, as you'll see, in his affidavit. That's finding of fact 210. He had access to two top-secret highly classified Israeli documents which disclosed: Iran is aided by

Hezbollah's operational infrastructure abroad, through Imad Mughniyah for the purpose of attacks.

Hezbollah terrorists train in Iran, which now we know, and Iran usually refrains from carrying out attacks directly, and its involvement usually follows an indirect course, Imad Mughniyah.

I am going to go a little faster because I think

Mr. Fleming has talked about Khartoum. One of the most amazing

photographs of all time would have been Imad Mughniyah meeting

Osama bin Laden in Khartoum 1993. I presume that photograph

doesn't exist or it certainly hasn't surfaced yet. It's at

that meeting where the tactic of suicide attacks became the

topic of conversation between Mughniyah and bin Laden. Of

course, Mughniyah had been by '93 and continued to remain a

major connection point between Iran and al Qaeda.

By this time we know, your Honor, that much of al Qaeda's training was carried out in camps in Iran by MOIS and IRGC.

We are on slide 80, finding of fact 213 to 215.

Mr. Fleming I believe already mentioned that in 1996 when bin

Laden and al Qaeda were made to leave Sudan, it was the Iranian

intelligence services that assisted them in moving their

operation and members, assisted them.

Iran and Lebanese Hezbollah trainers traveled between

Iran and Afghanistan transferring to al Qaeda fighters such

material as blueprints, drawings of bombs, manuals for wireless equipment, instruction booklets and information regarding the avoidance of unmanned aircraft.

After al Zawahiri's return to Afghanistan with Osama bin Laden, Iran authorities helped him on many occasions to pass weaponry and reinforcements to al Qaeda across the border from Iran to Afghanistan.

Your Honor, we are on slide 82, and I think I am down to my last three or thereabouts. Last one.

Your Honor, the Israeli and American intelligence agents have examined the document Mr. Fleming made reference to dated May 14, 2001, and they found it to be authentic. It reveals both high-level links between Iran's supreme leader and the al Qaeda leadership involving knowledge and support of a major upcoming event. Of course, the major upcoming event was September 11.

That document states finding of fact 218, that it was the Iranian government's goal to damage America and Israel's economic systems discrediting their institutions.

In conclusion, and finally, your Honor, thank you for your patience, Dr. Ronen Bergman writes: The Islamic Republic of Iran was, and is, a benefactor of, and provided material aid, resources and support to Osama bin Laden and al Qaeda both before and after the attacks of September 11 against the United States.

Is there anything you'd like to say, Tim? Your Honor if Mr. Fleming may --

THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Fleming.

MR. FLEMING: Your Honor, thank you. During my presentation, there was one point that I — a set of cites that I wanted to give to the sealed documents regarding the issue of the fact of Iran's preknowledge of 9/11. Therefore, it was obviously very important testimony which occurs in the Exhibit S7, testimony of witness Z, pages 43 to 52, and 55 all the way to 90, page 103. And then exhibits 7, 8, 9 and 10 addressing that subject.

Then the only other thing I wanted to point out, your Honor, also was that with respect to all three of the witnesses, I would also like to point out that the sealed affidavit of Kenneth Timmerman addresses many significant aspects of the investigation and how we came to be able to obtain the testimony of the three defective witnesses. Since that's sealed, I wanted to point it out in its entirety to the Court that Mr. Timmerman was there for the entire investigation and for all testimony, so it is a good affidavit on that subject.

MR. MELLON: If I may have one more minute, your

Honor. I failed to move in all the affidavits of all the

experts we submitted on May 19 and respectfully request your

Honor to accept those. Likewise, we had a supplemental

affidavit of Patrick Clawson filed in August involving instrumentalities and agencies.

Finally, your Honor, we have asked Mr. Stephen Corr to address the Court for just a minute involving some housekeeping administrative and ministerial matters.

Mr. Corr?

MR. CORR: Your Honor, the third amended complaint which is the current complaint in this matter raises causes of action under both the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act and the Alien Tort Claims Act. This morning we filed the declaration of Melina Goldfarb who is one of our attorneys here. In the declaration, she states that she and her team have determined that each and every one of the plaintiffs in the above-captioned lawsuit is either a United States citizen or is asserting a claim that derives from the death of a United States citizen in the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

When we started this morning, your Honor asked about the findings of fact and conclusions of law. Based on the findings and the discussions with all of the clients and their citizenship, we are going to provide you with a revised findings of fact and conclusions of law that will exclude the Alien Tort Claims Act because everybody is a U.S. citizen.

THE COURT: There was specific in there for non-citizens is my recollection.

MR. CORR: Your Honor, if I would, I would hand up the

declaration here and move that into evidence as well.

THE COURT: That will be received.

MR. CORR: Your Honor asked for an electronic copy. We will get that to you tomorrow.

The last point I think is that there are actually two motions pending before your Honor. There is a motion for judgment by default against the sovereign defendants; that's what we've been discussing here today. Of course, you have heard about the affidavits and you've read that they talk about clear and convincing evidence, but we know from 1605(a) of the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act that the burden is evidence satisfactory to the Court. I think you can see from the pile of evidence that has been moved before you that we far exceed that very limited burden under the Foreign Sovereign Immunities Act.

The second motion is a motion for judgment by default against the non-sovereign defendants. That, of course, did not require a hearing. That is pending before your Honor as well, and we want to bring that to your attention.

Your Honor, ten years ago, Fiona Havlish started this case. Today she and her co-plaintiffs would respectfully request that you enter judgment against both the sovereign defendants and the non-sovereign defendants, judgment in their favor against all of those defendants, and then provide us with an opportunity for a hearing either with yourself or with Judge

Maas to begin the process — to come up and formulate a process for establishing the damages for each of the individual plaintiffs in this case.

MR. MELLON: Your Honor, if I may, are there any other Havlish lawyers that wish to address the Court?

THE COURT: Let me make this --

MR. FLEMING: Your Honor, I'm sorry. I just think that -- I'm glad Mr. Mellon mentioned Dr. Clawson's extra affidavit because I didn't ask to move into admission Exhibits 38 through 41.

THE COURT: They will be admitted.

Let me make this determination at this point. There has been an extensive record submitted to the Court. That extensive record which includes sealed and unsealed submissions including fact and expert testimony by affidavit as outlined here at this hearing establishes plaintiffs' claims by credible evidence satisfactory to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Section 1608(e). I accept as true the plaintiffs' uncontroverted evidence.

This Court will issue an order consistent with the plaintiffs' proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law.

The evidence in this case supports a finding that consistent with its designation as a state sponsor of terrorism, Iran and the sovereign defendants were indeed responsible for providing material aid and support for terrorist acts against the United

States, its citizens and interests and others including the terrorist attacks on 9/11, and it provided such material aid and support before, during and after 9/11. This Court will issue default judgment against all defendants based upon the record that exists before this Court.

What I am going to ask you to do is several things:

I'd like to see three separate documents. One with

regard to a proposed judgment for the non-sovereign defendants.

If you will work with the clerk's office in terms of form and

procedure as to what they would require as sufficient, it would

facilitate the filing of the judgment, but run it by the

clerk's office first in terms of whether that is satisfactory

if my signature is upon it for filing.

I would ask you to give me the order with findings of facts and conclusions of law as you propose it as amended on disc and in hard copy, if you can change it on the hard copy, and submit that to me, separate out the judgment from the order which has the findings of fact and conclusions of law.

Propose to me again a separate judgment with regard to the sovereign defendants approved by the clerk's office for filing.

So when I receive those from you, I will execute those or modify them as needed and file them immediately.

There was some reference earlier to possibly supplementing some of the presentation or references to the

evidence given the unsealing by letter. If you wish to do that, just submit that by letter with a request in the letter to have it filed, and I will order that filed as part of the record if you think there is something further that you want to specifically reference that was not referenced today and that is warranted in light of the motion for unsealing.

While we were here, I reviewed the application to unseal certain documents. I have granted that application.

You should have a copy of that order that was proposed to me.

I signed that general order, and that should already be filed on ECF. It was scanned during the break after I signed it. So that order is issued.

As I indicated, I think following up on that order rather than trying to get involved with the clerk's office as to what should be unsealed and what should remain sealed, I am going to leave it up to you to file an unsealed redacted copy of the material in the form that you wish to have it unsealed consistent with the order.

The clerk's office should accept those redacted unsealed documents for filing. If they indicate to you that they need a subsequent further order to accept those further documents for filing — they should not, but if they do — indicate that to me and then send to me a proposed order which I will sign right away.

At this point, unless it warrants a different way to

proceed, I think I am going to go ahead and make a referral right away to Magistrate Judge Maas. He has been doing an excellent job in moving things along in the last few months.

We've been in constant communication. I think that unless he tells me or you tell me it is more complicated than what further burdens I should put upon him, I am going to make a referral to Magistrate Judge Maas for request on damages so you can immediately submit that to Magistrate Judge Maas, he can perform the inquest, and we can move forward with a further supplement to the judgment of default itself laying out and delineating what the damages are that flow from that.

I think that is the way that we should proceed. We will await in the next few days or whenever you can get to me those items. As soon as I receive those items, I will execute them and file them as appropriate.

I will immediately today tell Magistrate Judge Maas that he should anticipate hearing from the parties with regard to an inquest on damages and what you can accomplish through that.

MR. CORR: Your Honor, if I may, I do have a revised findings of fact and conclusions of law. We took out the word proposed. I did separate out an order of judgment that I know your Honor just mentioned that we should talk to the clerk's office about. I can tell you that we took the order of judgment, I believe it's word for word, from the Owens judgment

that was entered in D.C. Essentially it just says that default judgment is granted and final judgment on liability is entered in favor of the plaintiffs against the defendants. It is ordered that the parties shall appear for a status conference with a special master. That may be something that you want to take out. It does leave room for a date and time for a hearing.

THE COURT: I will discuss that with Magistrate Judge Maas.

MR. CORR: If I could hand this up and I could speak with your clerk.

THE COURT: Yes. I still need to look at it because you, for example, did you take out the reference to non U.S. citizens?

MR. CORR: Yes, your Honor, we took out everything that referenced the Alien Tort Claims Act. So all of those things that we wanted to remove once we confirmed that everybody was a U.S. citizen, we edited that.

THE COURT: So that's already made as suggested here.

MR. CORR: Right. That is what will be coming to you electronically.

THE COURT: All right. Then just give me the disk. I think that should be sufficient. I am going to need some signature lines on the orders and some line changes on the order as opposed to the judgment. Also, you are going to give

1cfQhavC2 me a similar judgment on the non-sovereign. MR. CORR: Your Honor, I have the non-sovereign one that was drafted with the original motion, and I will check that and make sure it is OK. THE COURT: As soon as we get that, I this we can execute that and move forward on the issue of damages. All right. MR. MELLON: Your Honor, thank you for the opportunity before you today. Thank you. THE COURT: You're welcome. (Adjourned)